PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
06. OMB 0664 Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031 U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

		Application Number	er	09/835,164		
PE TRANSMITTAL FORM		Filing Date		April 13, 2001		
		First Named Inven	tor	Shujin Zhang et al.		
ريع 2005 ع	Art Unit		2182			
(to be seed for all correspondence after initial filing)		Examiner Name		Patel, Niketa I.		
(to Assed for all correspondence after initial filing)  Aumber of Pages in This Submission 2		Attorney Docket N	umber	CISCO-3840		
		SURES (check all tha	t apply)			
Fee Transmittal Form	☐ Drawing(s			After Allowance Communication to TC		
Fee Attached	Licensing-related Papers			Appeal Communication to Board		
Amendment / Reply	Petition			of Appeals and Interferences Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)		
After Final	Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application			Proprietary Information		
Affidavits/declaration(s)	Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address			Status Letter		
Extension of Time Request	Terminal Disclaimer			Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):		
Express Abandonment Request	Request for Refund CD, Number of CD(s)			Applicant/Attorney Interview Summary; return postcard		
☐ Information Disclosure Statement	Landscape Table on CD					
Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)	Remarks					
Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application						
Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR1.52 or 1.53						
SIG	NATURE OF	APPLICANT, ATTO	RNEY, OF	R AGENT		
Firm	THELEN REID	& PRIEST LLP				
Signature	Marsh	Lud				
Printed Name	Marc S. Hanish					
Date December 1, 20		Reg. No. 42		42,626	42,626	
	CERTIFICA	TE OF TRANSMISS	ION/MAI	LING		
I hereby certify that this corresponder Service with sufficient postage as fit Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the data	rst class mail i	n an envelope addres	ne USPTO ssed to: C	or deposited ommissioner	with the United States Post for Patents, P.O. Box 1450	
Signature	anon E	(18m)			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Typed or printed name Sharon E	Byam	*		Date	December 1, 2005	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



## Applicant/Attorney Interview Summary

Application No.: <u>09/835,164</u>									
Examiner: Niketa I. Patel Art Unit: 2665 Status of Application: Pending									
Participants: (1) Examiner Niketa I. Patel (2) Marc S. Hanish, Reg. No. 42,626									
(3)(4)									
Date of Interview: August 15, 2005									
Type of Interview:  (a) [X] Telephonic  (b) [] Personal  (c) [] Video Conference  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: [] YES  [X] NO  If yes, provide brief description:									
ii yes, provide brief description:									
Issues Claims/ (Rej., Obj., etc) Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	N/A					
(1) <u>Claim 53</u> (2) (3) (4)		[X] [] []	[] [] []	[X] [] []					
[] Continuation Sheet Attached [] Copy of Draft Amendment (attached)									
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:									
The amendment to Claim 53 appears to overcome the prior art of record, however, further search and/or consideration may be required.									
Note: The MPEP, section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record  A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the Examiner was reached at the interview.									
In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an Examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed be the Applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)									
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature) (CISCO-3840)									